

The Sun.

SUNDAY, APRIL 11, 1886.

THE SUN to-day consists of twelve pages. Our friends should see that their newspaper is furnished with the entire paper.

Several hundred militia stood guard in the railroad yards at East St. Louis yesterday, preventing further disorder and checking the destruction of property. The fires of Friday night destroyed forty-two cars, worth, with their contents, about \$150,000. The coal miners along the Illinois and St. Louis Railroad quit work yesterday, to cripple the Missouri Pacific Railroad.

The deputy sheriff who killed seven people in East St. Louis on Friday asserted yesterday that the crowd fired upon them first. This line of defense seems to be wholly untenable, as no proof has yet been adduced to substantiate it.

Two Remarkable Speeches.

We understand that many Democrats intend to circulate as a campaign document the speech in which a Republican Senator, the Hon. JOHN J. INGALLS of Kansas, recently fixed the place of the Mugwump in natural history. They cannot do better.

With equal propriety the Republican managers might send broadcast the remarks of that able and honest Democrat, Senator VANCE of North Carolina, on the bill to repeal the Civil Service law. That, too, is a merciless exposure of the humbug Mugwump. There has been no more thorough demonstration of the sexless character and hopeless sterility of the being who is trying to create a new system of American government, than VANCE'S ridicule is not sharper than VANCE'S logic.

It is to the common interest of both parties to aid in the suppression of the Mugwump nuisance. There is encouragement in the fact that two such men as INGALLS and VANCE, standing on opposite sides of the Senate chamber and approaching the subject from rather different points of view, have undertaken the same task, namely, the forcible assertion of the principle that in our politics there can be no substitute for the healthy rivalry of partisanship.

Mr. VANCE'S speech is printed to-day in another part of THE SUN. It will be found as full of humor and of bright phrasing as of sound political doctrine. The Mug is a fine provocation of wit, and he is getting a good deal of it just at present. Everybody will read VANCE'S speech with interest. Even the civil service reformer can peruse it with profit, provided his infatuation is not quite hopeless. It will have the effect of a dash of cold water on a noddle congested with self-conceit, but it will do him good.

Mr. Gladstone's Critics in a Fix.

As the debate proceeds on Mr. GLADSTONE'S proposal to revive the Dublin Parliament, special heed is naturally given to the speeches of the Whig and Radical dissenters on whose aid Conservatives rely to defeat the measure. The first impression made by the unfriendly comments of Lord HARTINGTON and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN is one of surprise at the feebleness and insincerity of their objections. But a moment's reflection will convince us that the unwonted weakness of these veteran politicians is itself a proof of the service rendered to Ireland by the mere introduction, under Government endorsement, of a home rule project, however crude and faulty. They feel themselves placed at an immense moral and dialectical disadvantage by a Liberal Prime Minister's deliberate avowal that Ireland's demand for legislative liberty is just. They foresee that the masses of their party will refuse to follow them in mutiny unless they can suggest some substitute for the measure they denounce, and they feel themselves off by Mr. GLADSTONE'S vindication of the fundamental principle contended for by Ireland, from recurring to the one logical and feasible alternative to generous concession—namely, to wit, implacable coercion. This, at least, has been gained by the PARLIAMENTARY movement which on Thursday culminated in the memorable address of Mr. GLADSTONE, the so-called Liberal will hereafter dare never to the expedient which in the case of Ireland has been always kept in view and repeatedly invoked—the expedient, namely, of ruling by the sword.

The Conservatives are in a much less awkward predicament, so far at least as the present debate is concerned. They, at all events, cannot be taunted with failing to offer an alternative for acquiescence in Ireland's demands. They have, undoubtedly, a policy, such as it is, which they avowed with brutal candor during their late term of office. It will not have been forgotten that when they were beaten on the COLLINGS agrarian proposition, they had just given notice through their spokesmen in the Commons of an intention to bring in, only two days later, a rigorous Coercion bill. Their position, therefore, for the moment seems sufficiently simple and consistent. They propose to govern Ireland, as England has long governed her, in accordance with the savage traditions of STRAFFORD and of CHOLWELL, and they now say to rebellious Whigs and Radicals: Assist us to beat GLADSTONE, and we will soon show you whether thirty millions of Englishmen and Scotchmen have not strength enough to deal with five millions of Irishmen. But unluckily for the eventual, and even the transient success of a coalition with such a sinister aim, the Whig and Radical seceders cannot venture, in face of Mr. GLADSTONE'S vindication of magnanimity and justice, to advocate the application of brute force to Ireland. It is, indeed, but just to Mr. CHAMBERLAIN to remember that he declared his purpose of resigning from the late Liberal Cabinet sooner than consent to a renewal of the Crimes act. Neither have we any reason to suppose that Lord HARTINGTON is less teachable by facts than Lord SPENCER, who is known to have acknowledged that coercion, of which he spoke as an expert, is an utter failure. Predisposed themselves against harsh measures, and recognizing that the national conscience roused by Mr. GLADSTONE will never again tolerate club law, Lord HARTINGTON and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN can find no solid ground for joint action with the Conservatives, who for their part stand on the dishonored and shattered platform of coercion.

That is why the adverse speeches of the leaders of the Whig and Radical malcontents were so strangely inconclusive and irrelevant. It will be noticed that Lord HARTINGTON and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN lay stress upon objections taken, not from their own point of view, which is opposed to any substantial advance toward legislative separation, but from the point of view of Irishmen and of their American sympathizers, who naturally desire the largest measure of home rule possible. Those gentlemen, who do not wish to give Ireland anything, criticize Mr. GLADSTONE'S project on the ground that it does not go far enough. They mean, it seems, to vote against the bill on the pretext that it lacks certain provisions needed to make it theoretically perfect, not one of

which provisions, however, would Lord HARTINGTON or Mr. CHAMBERLAIN pledge himself to support. In other words, because Mr. GLADSTONE only feels able at this moment to offer half a loaf, these professed amateurs of constitutional perfection prefer to give Ireland a stone. Both Lord HARTINGTON and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN object to the exclusion of Irish representatives from Westminster. Well, we are sorry for it, too. It is understood that a section of the Pall Mall members are pleased with this feature of the GLADSTONE plan; but Irish-Americans, or, at all events, that large proportion of them who read THE SUN, have deemed it prudent to combine with a State legislature the existing right to send delegates to St. Stephen's, both because Ireland would thus have a voice in determining the Imperial budget of which she would have to bear a share, and because she would thus possess a guarantee of keeping the local rights already won, and a most effective instrument for acquiring more hereafter. We concur with Lord HARTINGTON in thinking that State rights for Scotland and for Wales would be the natural corollaries of State rights for Ireland, and that, with three local legislatures in operation, it would be preposterous for the rump of English members remaining at Westminster to monopolize the management of Imperial concerns. So preposterous would such a result appear to Englishmen themselves, that if our American federal system did not exist for an example, it would be spontaneously invented in the United Kingdom.

We accept, therefore, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S avowal that Federalism raised the flag above the ultimate solution of the Irish as well as the colonial problem of the British empire. But if he were as sincere as we are in the advocacy of the federative principle, he would draw a different deduction with respect to his action on a bill which takes a first step and a long step toward Ireland's legislative independence. He would prove the honesty of his intention to give Ireland the whole of her just dues in the end, by giving her to-day the largest possible installment. He would feel the cogency of Mr. HEALY'S rejoinder, that, before you solemnize the ceremony of federative wedlock, you must have parties to join; and that Ireland without a legislature of her own would lack the essential organ of national individuality and of legal consent.

Mr. MORLEY found it easy to foil the maneuvers by which Lord HARTINGTON and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN sought to make their hostility to home rule of any genuine kind. He had only to remind them that if they honestly thought the present proposal too stilted in any particular, they could essay to enlarge and improve it in committee. But if their objections were only pretences for wrecking the bill altogether, they must look the real problem in the face, and be at once prepared with an alternative plan for the government of Ireland. He ridiculed Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S suggestion of a six months' truce, to secure which would require the acquiescence of both parties. And he warned him that for home rule there could be no alternative but reversion to the coercion which Mr. CHAMBERLAIN has professed to abhor, a coercion, too, that this time would have to be applied on a colossal scale and with the most detestable agencies. That is the dilemma with which the Liberal deserters are confronted, and they seem certain to be tossed upon its horns in the arena of popular discussion, whatever may be the transient effect of their defection in the House of Commons.

Religious and Secular Education.

A meeting of clergymen and laymen belonging to what are known as the evangelical churches was held at an up-town private residence on Monday evening, to discuss this question: "Ought the State to see that provision is made for popular instruction in the fundamentals of religion?" The purpose of those who have brought the subject forward at this time, we infer, is to attract to it the attention of Protestants generally, for it seems that the question was debated with much earnestness at a previous conference, and is to be further discussed at future meetings of representative Protestants. It will also naturally engage the interest of the religious newspapers and of the members of the Liberal Union, which there are many. Therefore, we shall give both Protestants and Catholics giving their thought to the great question whether education can be divorced from religion without danger to the moral welfare of society.

In opening the debate on Monday evening, President SEELYE of Amherst College, and formerly a member of Congress from Massachusetts, took substantially the Catholic ground with respect to public education. "No nation," he said, "was ever saved by its intelligence. We must have virtue; and how are we going to get virtue? By inculcating precepts of morality? But the teaching of morality has never uplifted society, no matter how purely taught. There must be religious instruction, and how shall it be given? It cannot and will not be given sufficiently in the family or in the Church. The State, therefore, should give religious instruction as it gives instruction in letters."

These sentences, which we have quoted from different parts of the report of President SEELYE'S remarks, will do as an outline of his argument, which was, even more briefly, that the State could only be preserved by religion, and that, accordingly, religious instruction was not only within its province, but was also necessary for the well-being of the community. Even the temporal good of society, he contended further, requires that there shall be no divorce between religion and education, for the experience of the present century shows that there has been a large and steady increase of insanity because of secular education, and the assaults lately directed against property and the family, the pillars of the State, have been made by men of intellect, who were trained apart from religion.

The Rev. HOWARD CHURCH, D. D., the well-known Presbyterian divine, took the other side. Property and the family, he argued, are not now in more danger than formerly. "In the middle ages the inroads upon domestic life were much greater, and property a hundred fold more insecure than it is to-day in this city or in St. Louis. Property is not at all in danger to-day," he declared more emphatically. "This uprising of the Knights of Labor is but the reaction against the oppressions of capital. The trouble is not with the Socialists, but that corporations during the past twenty years have treated men as brutes, and the American citizen could not and would not stand it."

So promising, Dr. CHURCH proceeded to ask, what sort of religion the State should furnish, if President SEELYE'S advice was taken. The Chinese, the agnostics, the Jewish, the Roman Catholic? He said, in his opinion, was altogether impracticable, and Christians would only succeed in begetting society by the religious influence proceeding from the family and from the Church. He would have no religion taught in the public schools, and spoke of the reading of the Scriptures as a travesty of religion.

It will be seen, therefore, that the two clergymen, both leading representatives of the Calvinistic theology, are at direct issue as to this subject, and that they furnish the opposing arguments which must be used in any further discussion of secular education. Undoubtedly Dr. CHURCH is right in saying that before we undertake to give religious instruction in the schools, we must decide the question as to what the fundamentals of religion—what are they? The Protestants, who are in alarm because of the Roman Catholics demand freedom of worship in the reformatory schools, declare that there is no reason for a change, since already the "fundamentals of religion" are kind everywhere ought to be content with. But the Catholics are not quieted, and reply that what they regard as fundamental in omitted, and what they hold to be sectarian and directly hostile to their Church and its doctrines is always included.

It seems to us, therefore, that the position of Dr. CHURCH is the only position for the Protestants to take. They must either come out squarely in favor of secular education wholly, or they must give up the argument to the Catholics.

By Rail to Merv.

Five years and one month ago O'DONOVAN made his famous horseback journey to Merv, returning after five months' residence there to give us our first detailed description of the Merv oasis. It is only two years ago that the Russian Cosacs raised their flag above the Kalak fortress and proclaimed the 200,000 residents of the oasis to be subjects of the white Czar. The rush of events has now brought the locomotive almost to the banks of the Murghab River, and we are likely any day to hear that the Merv oasis, recently one of the least known and most mysterious parts of the world, has been joined at last by iron rails to the civilization of the West.

"We will carry the road to Merv this spring, and to the Oxus before the close of the year," said Gen. ANZENKOFF, the Russian engineer, in February. At last accounts the roadbed was completed to Merv, the tracks were laid to within one hundred miles of the oasis, stations and bridges were building, and grading for the road between Merv and the Oxus was about to begin. The Emir of Bokhara had agreed to provide material for a wooden bridge across the Murghab, and now they are ready to be pushed on to Bokhara, Samarcand, and Tashkend, making a continuous track east of the Caspian Sea as long as the roads that connect New York with Chicago.

It is a wonderful illustration of the progress of this age that Merv, where O'DONOVAN for a time was virtually a prisoner; Bokhara, where VAMBERY lived as a Moham-medan mendicant, and STODDART and CONOLLY were put to death because they were white men; and Tashkend, which the Russian invaders captured by storm, within forty-three years of the occurrence of all these events are to be connected by rail with the Western world which they so bitterly hated and from which for ages they have been almost completely isolated.

This is the railroad that, when war clouds and Russia, extended scarcely two hundred miles east of the Caspian, under the stimulus of that threatened trouble the road was rapidly pushed forward, soldiers and laborers digging side by side. For a time the road grew even at night, when electric lights illumined the work of track laying. Stretching over almost level, sandy wastes, no engineering difficulties have been met, few cuttings or bridges are needed, and the line will therefore be one of the cheapest railroads ever built.

"Russia's project," said the Governor-General of the Caucasus a while ago, "is to reclaim the four great oases of Russian Central Asia." She is carrying out her design as rapidly as any people could do. Even more wonderful than this great railroad skirting the dreary Kara Kum desert is the vivifying effect which the enterprise and its Russian promoters produce upon that hitherto almost changeless region. Askaniya has become an important station. Under the bustling little mart, and near the fort of Merv a young city is rising. Houses, many of them inhabited by Russian colonists, are springing up there as if by magic, and soon, according to Gen. ANZENKOFF, it will be a fine town, "with broad streets and pavements, and avenues planted with trees." The fifty thousand Russians in the oasis regions of Central Asia are evidence that no nation knows better than Russia how to repopulate new countries or to reconcile the natives to the yoke of the conqueror. Half of the little city of Merv is Russian to-day, and the other inhabitants are beginning to appropriate the language, the dress, and the customs of the invaders. "The Government of the Czar," says the Persian journal *Shamsa*, "is sparing neither silver, presents, honors, nor flattery to make true Russians of the Mervites." The object has been to bring their sons will be sent to acquire the language of the West in the schools of St. Petersburg as soon as they can speak a little Russian; and to accelerate their progress in this language school books printed both in the Russian and Persian tongues have been placed in their hands.

It is thus that Russia is extending her influence and increasing her power in her Central Asian possessions. Her great railroad enterprise is first of all a military necessity, but without a doubt it is destined in time to become of large commercial importance. The commerce of Turkestan, amounting in 1884 to 23,000,000 roubles, has doubled since 1866, and the Russians assert that this trade will very largely expand when their new railroad opens the rich valleys of Zerishan, the fertile valleys of the Oxus, and the fertile valleys of the Amu Darya, and makes Tashkend, Khokand, Samarcand and easily accessible from Europe. The road now nearing Merv will almost revolutionize the conditions of life in a vast region. A branch road will in time very likely extend to Herat, and the Russians themselves are directing the attention of England to the fact that if the English will extend the road there is now building through the Bolan Pass to join the Russian line at the northern frontier of Afghanistan, London will be placed within ten or twelve days' reach of Calcutta by rail.

A Question of Etiquette.

This is from a young man of New York who is anxious to observe every rule of social propriety, lest he be accused of unfamiliarity with the usages of the polite world, but who wants more freedom in one respect than he fears, is allowed him by strict social law:

"It is considered a breach of etiquette on the part of a gentleman to ask a young lady to accompany him to a place of amusement, without at the same time extending the invitation to her mother or some other member of the family, in order that she may have a chaperone."

Yes, it would be a breach of propriety in the society to which our friend refers. The law there is that the girl must have a chaperone, and the young man is denied the pleasure of her exclusive company at public amusements. He must make up a party of three, no matter how much the third person may interfere with his enjoyment by preventing him from exercising all his fascinations. We sympathize with him in his rebellion, for we understand his feeling and situation exactly; but that is the rule among

the people with whom he desires to stand well, and we cannot change it.

But these people are only a few among the many. What is called society more exclusively in New York comprises, all told, no more than a hundred or two hundred families. Outside of them, of course, there are larger circles to which they give the law to a million and a half of inhabitants who pay obedience to that law is not over a few thousand.

Nine girls out of ten in New York, with the full consent of their parents and as a matter of course, accompany young men to amusements without taking a chaperone along. They feel and they are entirely able to look out for themselves, and they would regard the whole fun as spoiled if a third person was on hand to watch over them. A large part of the audience at every theatre is always made up of young men and young women who have come out in pairs, and who have no thought of violating any rule of propriety. Very many of these girls would never be invited to the theatre by their male acquaintances if they were under the dominion of such a usage, for the men want them to themselves, else they would not ask their company, and, besides, do not feel able to pay for an extra ticket for an obnoxious third person; or if they have a little more money to spare they prefer to expend it on an occasional indulgence at the play.

Nor can it be said that the morals of these less formal young people are any worse than those of the more exacting society. Probably they are better on the average, and if the laws of Murray Hill prevailed throughout this city, the marriage rate of New York would be likely to decline, for nothing discourages the passion of the average young man so much as his inability to meet the chaperon except in the presence of a third person, who acts as a buffer between him and her. He feels that he has no show, and cannot appear to good advantage under the eyes of a cool critic, whereas if he could walk with the girl alone in the shades of the balmy evening, the courage to declare his affection would come to him.

Therefore it is that engagements, even in the most fashionable society, are commonly made in the early days of the summer, when the young people come together more freely and more constantly than in the town. Long journeys and long voyages are also favorable for stimulating matrimonial desires in the hearts of bachelors, who are thus brought into daily and hourly contact with fair fellow travelers. A prudent mamma will often relax the social restrictions under such circumstances, when the young man has won favor in her eyes and the marriage seems desirable to her.

The most numerous society of New York, it is proper to add, is more strict in its requirements as to the conduct of young women than are the circles which regard themselves as superior. When a girl accepts a young man as her company she must appear in public without his consent, and even in her own home must carefully abstain from giving any encouragement to the attentions and pretensions of rivals, though her company has not yet thought of proposing marriage; and he must be equally on his guard as to his conduct toward women generally.

So, you see, young friend, that wherever you go in New York you will find what you call etiquette, and must be careful not to run counter to the conventions to which prudence and propriety exact obedience.

THE GREAT WHISKY QUESTION.

Opinion of Attorney-General Garland.

Department of Justice, Washington, March 25, 1886.

The Secretary of the Treasury.

Sir: Your communication of the 19th March last, asking an opinion as to "whether imported goods, wares, and merchandise, the product or manufacture of the United States, and which are subject to a duty equal to the tax imposed by the Internal Revenue laws, are entitled to the privilege of the bonded warehouse system prescribed by sections 25, 26, 27, and 28 of the Act of March 3, 1879, in relation to bonded goods, wares, and merchandise, are entitled to the privilege of the bonded warehouse system."

The law referred to, R. S. 25, admits to entry for storage in a bonded warehouse "any merchandise, subject to duty," brought into any port of entry of the United States, and to deny the right to enter for storage imported domestic merchandise is to refuse to give proper effect to the words of the law.

The opinion of my predecessor of the 22d of July, 1883, to which you refer, does not admit of the construction that has been put on it in the Treasury Department. It is to be understood that the law is not intended to be applied to imports, but to goods brought into the country from a foreign port, and that in such cases the privilege of importation cannot be enjoyed by a domestic merchandise taken out of the country upon a bonded warehouse, and that in such cases the privilege of importation cannot be enjoyed by a domestic merchandise taken out of the country upon a bonded warehouse, and that in such cases the privilege of importation cannot be enjoyed by a domestic merchandise taken out of the country upon a bonded warehouse.

The law referred to, R. S. 25, admits to entry for storage in a bonded warehouse "any merchandise, subject to duty," brought into any port of entry of the United States, and to deny the right to enter for storage imported domestic merchandise is to refuse to give proper effect to the words of the law.

The opinion of my predecessor of the 22d of July, 1883, to which you refer, does not admit of the construction that has been put on it in the Treasury Department. It is to be understood that the law is not intended to be applied to imports, but to goods brought into the country from a foreign port, and that in such cases the privilege of importation cannot be enjoyed by a domestic merchandise taken out of the country upon a bonded warehouse, and that in such cases the privilege of importation cannot be enjoyed by a domestic merchandise taken out of the country upon a bonded warehouse.

The law referred to, R. S. 25, admits to entry for storage in a bonded warehouse "any merchandise, subject to duty," brought into any port of entry of the United States, and to deny the right to enter for storage imported domestic merchandise is to refuse to give proper effect to the words of the law.

The opinion of my predecessor of the 22d of July, 1883, to which you refer, does not admit of the construction that has been put on it in the Treasury Department. It is to be understood that the law is not intended to be applied to imports, but to goods brought into the country from a foreign port, and that in such cases the privilege of importation cannot be enjoyed by a domestic merchandise taken out of the country upon a bonded warehouse, and that in such cases the privilege of importation cannot be enjoyed by a domestic merchandise taken out of the country upon a bonded warehouse.

The law referred to, R. S. 25, admits to entry for storage in a bonded warehouse "any merchandise, subject to duty," brought into any port of entry of the United States, and to deny the right to enter for storage imported domestic merchandise is to refuse to give proper effect to the words of the law.

The opinion of my predecessor of the 22d of July, 1883, to which you refer, does not admit of the construction that has been put on it in the Treasury Department. It is to be understood that the law is not intended to be applied to imports, but to goods brought into the country from a foreign port, and that in such cases the privilege of importation cannot be enjoyed by a domestic merchandise taken out of the country upon a bonded warehouse, and that in such cases the privilege of importation cannot be enjoyed by a domestic merchandise taken out of the country upon a bonded warehouse.

The law referred to, R. S. 25, admits to entry for storage in a bonded warehouse "any merchandise, subject to duty," brought into any port of entry of the United States, and to deny the right to enter for storage imported domestic merchandise is to refuse to give proper effect to the words of the law.

The opinion of my predecessor of the 22d of July, 1883, to which you refer, does not admit of the construction that has been put on it in the Treasury Department. It is to be understood that the law is not intended to be applied to imports, but to goods brought into the country from a foreign port, and that in such cases the privilege of importation cannot be enjoyed by a domestic merchandise taken out of the country upon a bonded warehouse, and that in such cases the privilege of importation cannot be enjoyed by a domestic merchandise taken out of the country upon a bonded warehouse.

The law referred to, R. S. 25, admits to entry for storage in a bonded warehouse "any merchandise, subject to duty," brought into any port of entry of the United States, and to deny the right to enter for storage imported domestic merchandise is to refuse to give proper effect to the words of the law.

The opinion of my predecessor of the 22d of July, 1883, to which you refer, does not admit of the construction that has been put on it in the Treasury Department. It is to be understood that the law is not intended to be applied to imports, but to goods brought into the country from a foreign port, and that in such cases the privilege of importation cannot be enjoyed by a domestic merchandise taken out of the country upon a bonded warehouse, and that in such cases the privilege of importation cannot be enjoyed by a domestic merchandise taken out of the country upon a bonded warehouse.

The law referred to, R. S. 25, admits to entry for storage in a bonded warehouse "any merchandise, subject to duty," brought into any port of entry of the United States, and to deny the right to enter for storage imported domestic merchandise is to refuse to give proper effect to the words of the law.

The opinion of my predecessor of the 22d of July, 1883, to which you refer, does not admit of the construction that has been put on it in the Treasury Department. It is to be understood that the law is not intended to be applied to imports, but to goods brought into the country from a foreign port, and that in such cases the privilege of importation cannot be enjoyed by a domestic merchandise taken out of the country upon a bonded warehouse, and that in such cases the privilege of importation cannot be enjoyed by a domestic merchandise taken out of the country upon a bonded warehouse.

The law referred to, R. S. 25, admits to entry for storage in a bonded warehouse "any merchandise, subject to duty," brought into any port of entry of the United States, and to deny the right to enter for storage imported domestic merchandise is to refuse to give proper effect to the words of the law.

The opinion of my predecessor of the 22d of July, 1883, to which you refer, does not admit of the construction that has been put on it in the Treasury Department. It is to be understood that the law is not intended to be applied to imports, but to goods brought into the country from a foreign port, and that in such cases the privilege of importation cannot be enjoyed by a domestic merchandise taken out of the country upon a bonded warehouse, and that in such cases the privilege of importation cannot be enjoyed by a domestic merchandise taken out of the country upon a bonded warehouse.

The law referred to, R. S. 25, admits to entry for storage in a bonded warehouse "any merchandise, subject to duty," brought into any port of entry of the United States, and to deny the right to enter for storage imported domestic merchandise is to refuse to give proper effect to the words of the law.

The opinion of my predecessor of the 22d of July, 1883, to which you refer, does not admit of the construction that has been put on it in the Treasury Department. It is to be understood that the law is not intended to be applied to imports, but to goods brought into the country from a foreign port, and that in such cases the privilege of importation cannot be enjoyed by a domestic merchandise taken out of the country upon a bonded warehouse, and that in such cases the privilege of importation cannot be enjoyed by a domestic merchandise taken out of the country upon a bonded warehouse.

The law referred to, R. S. 25, admits to entry for storage in a bonded warehouse "any merchandise, subject to duty," brought into any port of entry of the United States, and to deny the right to enter for storage imported domestic merchandise is to refuse to give proper effect to the words of the law.

The opinion of my predecessor of the 22d of July, 1883, to which you refer, does not admit of the construction that has been put on it in the Treasury Department. It is to be understood that the law is not intended to be applied to imports, but to goods brought into the country from a foreign port, and that in such cases the privilege of importation cannot be enjoyed by a domestic merchandise taken out of the country upon a bonded warehouse, and that in such cases the privilege of importation cannot be enjoyed by a domestic merchandise taken out of the country upon a bonded warehouse.

PROPOSED NEW STATE.

The Bill for the Admission of Washington Territory Passed by the Senate.

WASHINGTON, April 10.—Among the petitions presented in the Senate to-day was one from Mr. HARRISON of the Territory of Washington, praying for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State. The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day.

The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day. The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day.

The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day. The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day.

The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day. The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day.

The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day. The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day.

The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day. The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day.

The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day. The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day.

The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day. The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day.

The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day. The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day.

The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day. The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day.

The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day. The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day.

The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day. The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day.

The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day. The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day.

The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day. The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day.

The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day. The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day.

The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day. The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day.

The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day. The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day.

The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day. The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day.

The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day. The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day.

The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day. The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day.

The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day. The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day.

The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day. The bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington to the Union as a State was passed by the Senate to-day.

PACIFIC RAILROAD INQUIRY.

Proposed Investigation of the Books and Accounts of the Companies.

WASHINGTON, April 10.—The House committee on Pacific Railroads to-day instructed Representative Richardson T. Townsend to report back a substitute for the Hanley resolution. It authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to appoint and fix the compensation of three competent persons and a stenographer, if necessary, to examine into the workings and financial management of the Pacific railroads that have received aid from the Government in bonds or land, to ascertain whether they have observed all the obligations imposed upon them by the laws under which they received such aid, or since passed in reference thereto, and whether their books and accounts are so kept as to show the net earnings of the aided roads, and the amount of the Government bonds or average mileage between aided and non-aided roads or parts of roads, and whether there is a diversion of such funds to less productive branches, or any other wrongful or improper purpose, and if so, how the same may be corrected. It also directs the Secretary of the Interior to cause to be made a full and complete audit of the accounts of the aided roads, and to report thereon to the House of Representatives. It also directs the Secretary of the Interior to cause to be made a full and complete audit of the accounts of the aided roads, and to report thereon to the House of Representatives.

The persons appointed shall have power to examine all books, papers, and methods of said roads, and to require the production of all monies and complete attendance of witnesses, and to administer oaths. They shall at all times be subject to the control and direction of the Secretary of the Interior, and may at any time be removed by him in his discretion. The committee also instructed the Secretary of the Interior to cause to be made a full and complete audit of the accounts of the aided roads, and to report thereon to the House of Representatives.

The persons appointed shall have power to examine all books, papers, and methods of said roads, and to require the production of all monies and complete attendance of witnesses, and to administer oaths. They shall at all times be subject to the control and direction of the Secretary of the Interior, and may at any time be removed by him in his discretion. The committee also instructed the Secretary of the Interior to cause to be made a full and complete audit of the accounts of the aided roads, and to report thereon to the House of Representatives.

The persons appointed shall have power to examine all books, papers, and methods of said roads, and to require the production of all monies and complete attendance of witnesses, and to administer oaths. They shall at all times be subject to the control and direction of the Secretary of the Interior, and may at any time be removed by him in his discretion. The committee also instructed the Secretary of the Interior to cause to be made a